

Title: Extended Day Program

Directions to participants: Use the scenario and information below to respond to the “Implementation as Intended “ sub-questions (a-c) of the program Evaluation Tool.

Brief description: Students who are identified using the STAR math and reading assessment as being behind one grade level or more were invited to attend an extended day program. Students participated in the extended day program one hour before and one hour after school each day. Targeted skills based tutoring were provided during this block of time using the Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) System for reading intervention and Accelerated Math for math intervention. The tutoring was provided using a combination of HQ teachers and HQ paraprofessionals working under the direction of the HQ teachers. Students were progress monitored for growth using the STAR math and reading assessment quarterly during the program year.

Program objective: By the conclusion of the program year, 100% of the identified students will show academic growth of 1.5 years or more, as measured by the STAR Math and Reading Tests.

Need being addressed: Based on a review of 2011-2012 MEAP and 2011-2012 end of year NWEA test data the school showed a weakness in overall math and reading proficiency. Only 40% of students scored proficient in reading and only 35% scored proficient in math on MEAP. Additionally, only 38% of students scored proficient in reading and 36% scored proficient in math as demonstrated on NWEA.

Student Achievement Results: STAR Math testing indicated 80% of the identified students showed growth of 1.5 years or more between the pre-test at the start of the year and an exit test at the conclusion of their time in the program.

Year end (Spring 2013) NWEA data showed 45% of all students were proficient in Math. MEAP data was not available for a group impacted by this intervention as the 2012-2013 MEAP test occurred prior to the start of this intervention.

STAR Reading testing indicated 90% of the identified students showed growth of 1.5 years or more between the pre-test at the start of the year and an exit test at the conclusion of their time in the program.

Year end (Spring 2013) NWEA data showed 49% of all students were proficient in Reading. MEAP data was not available for a group impacted by this intervention as the 2012-2013 MEAP test occurred prior to the implementation of this initiative.

Based on the STAR math test data 70% of Economically disadvantaged students met the growth objective, 75% of black students, 60% of Special education students, 80% of ELL students, 70% of male students, and 85% of female students.

Based on the STAR reading test data 80% of economically disadvantaged students met the growth objective, 85% of black students, 65% of Special education students, 85% of ELL students, 85% of male students, and 95% of female students.

The strategy proved least effective with males, economically disadvantaged, and special education. All sub-groups except female students showed fewer gains than the group average suggesting the highest gains were with non-minority, general education, and non-economically disadvantaged students.

Student attendance rate by subgroup (calculated as percent of students who have fewer than 3 absences during the program) was as follows: 72% economically disadvantaged, 80% special education, 79% black students, 94% English Language Learners, 72% male students and 87% female students.

Perceptions: Stakeholder surveys from all stakeholders indicated strong satisfaction with the intervention. Some staff identified that some high need students often did not take full advantage of the program. Other staff questioned why the time was not spent helping students complete their homework instead of giving them more work to do. This concern was also echoed by a few parents who were concerned that their children got home later than other children and still had homework left to complete. Some parents indicated that their child's participation was inhibited due to transportation issues.

Implementation Notes: Principal's walkthroughs showed that only 70% of program staff was implementing the program/initiative with fidelity. There was no evidence of collaboration between the teachers implementing the program and the rest of the staff including non-program classroom teachers, English Learner teachers and/or special education teachers. Professional development for implementation was primarily provided to the program staff who would implement the program/initiative at the initial stages of the program with no additional job-embedded ongoing professional learning. Collegial visits and common planning time were not provided to staff to coordinate efforts between program staff and non-program staff or to monitor students' progress during the day. Additional tweaks were made during the year based on issues that came up in staff, school improvement, and other meetings. The program schedule did not provide much time for collaboration between the supplemental staff and the core instructional staff.

The administrator relied on program staff to self-monitor and to help explain the program to novice staff due to their limited knowledge of the intervention. Some attempts were made by the administrator to monitor via walkthroughs. Program staff provided the administrator achievement data to show the effectiveness of the program.